

U.S. Patent Application No: 10/674,879

Page 9

REMARKS

Claim Amendments

With this amendment, claims 1, 3-6, 8-20 and 22-31 are in this application. Claims 2, 7 and 21 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 12, 17-20, 25 and 28 are being amended in the present response. The total number of independent claims is 8. Fees for 2 independent claims in excess of 3 have already been paid by Applicants. The Commissioner is authorized to charge the additional independent claim fees to deposit account no. 08-2025.

Clarity amendments

a) In section 2 of the Action, the Examiner objects to claim 21 on clarity grounds. Claim 21 has been canceled, thus rendering the objection of the Examiner moot.

b) In sections 3 and 4 of the Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicants have amended claims 1, 8 and 25 as suggested by the Examiner in sections 4.i, 4.ii and 4.iii, of the Action, thus overcoming the rejection.

c) In section 4.iv of the Action, the Examiner states that the term "*substantially*" on line 3 of claims 7, 10 and 11 does not clearly point out the Applicants' invention. Applicants respectfully disagree. In particular, Applicants note that MPEP 2173.05(b) D (the title of which is "Substantially") provides that the presence of "*substantially*" is definite once the person skilled in the art knows what is meant by it. In the present case, access data is supplied to the registries "*substantially simultaneously*." A network expert operating with client-server structures (the skilled person) fully understands that a signal sent by a common source to two different entities and intending to reach those entities simultaneously can reach one of the two before the other due to latency time, difference in the connections and so on. Therefore, presence of the mere term "*simultaneously*" without "*substantially*" would devoid Applicants of the opportunity to apply claims 7, 10 and 11 to such a reality. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw his rejection.

U.S. Patent Application No: 10/674,879
Page 10

d) Applicants have amended claim 9 and made it dependent on claim 6, on clarity grounds.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

a) In section 6 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 12-17 and 29-30 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,928,457 to Jacobs et al.

Claim 1

Applicants have amended claim 1 to incorporate the language of claim 2 and to also recite 1) that *"the access data [are] supplied to the client through the intermediate registry"* and 2) that *"the object server [is] arranged to supply the access data to the first and second object registries through the intermediate registry."* Support for this amendment can be found, for example, in Figure 2 of the application and related sections of the specification.

Applicants submit that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Jacobs. Applicants note that the Examiner addresses in section 8 of the Action an alleged presence of an "intermediate registry" in Jacobs by making reference to the RA RMI Stub 580 discussed at column 11 lines 19-56 in Jacobs. Incidentally, Applicants note that such stub is also shown in Figure 5A of Jacobs, inside client 504.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner and note that the cited RA RMI Stub 580 is part of client 504. To the contrary, the *"intermediate registry"* of claim 1 is *"hosted by an intermediate registry server"* and not part of a client. This is also made clear by the presence of the language *"the access data being supplied to the client through the intermediate registry"* in claim 1.

Moreover, claim 1 also recites that *"the object server [is] arranged to supply the access data to the first and second object registries through the intermediate*

U.S. Patent Application No: 10/674,879

Page 11

registry." This language clearly states that the intermediate registry is between the object server and the first and second registries. To the contrary, Jacobs does not show such feature.

Therefore, amended claim 1 is novel over Jacobs, together with claims 3, 4, 5, 14, 15, 16, 29 and 30, at least by virtue of their direct or indirect dependency on claim 1.

Claim 12

Applicants have amended claim 12 to make it independent by incorporating the language of claim 1 and to also recite that *"the object server [is] arranged to supply the access data to the first object registry."* Support for this amendment can be found, for example, in Figure 4 of the application and related sections of the specification.

Applicants submit that amended claim 12 is not anticipated by Jacobs. Applicants note that the Examiner addresses the features of claim 12 in section 11 of the Action by making reference to i) a name tree (column 5, lines 7-10 of Jacobs), ii) a JNDI-compliant naming service/server 302 (column 14, lines 23-47 of Jacobs), iii) the presence of the term 'duplicate' (column 5, lines 7-10 of Jacobs), and iv) a replicated naming service/server 303 (column 14, lines 23-47).

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner and note that amended claim 12 recites that *"the first and second servers compris[e] means to migrate a communication channel for carrying the request from the first server to the second server in the event of a fault associated with the first server."* Where is this migration between servers shown in Jacobs? With reference to Figure 4 in Jacobs, although server 302 and server 303 are connected to a communication medium 301, where does Jacobs discuss that there is a migration of a communication channel between 302 and 303 or vice versa? When one of the two servers does not work, there is just switching by the client (or the object server) to the other

U.S. Patent Application No: 10/674,879

Page 12

server, without any kind of migration occurring between those servers. For example, column 14 lines 31-33 of Jacobs address addition of an RA stud from servers to the provider and not between servers.

Moreover, amended claim 12 also recites that the servers are operated in “*active*” and “*stand-by*” modes. Where is this kind of operation shown in Jacobs?

In addition, Applicants have not been able to find where, in Jacobs, the feature “*the object server being arranged to supply the access data to the first object registry*” is disclosed.

Therefore, amended claim 12 is novel over Jacobs, together with claim 13, at least by virtue of its dependence on claim 12.

Claim 17

Applicants have amended claim 17 to recite that “*the object server [is] arranged to supply the access data to the first and second object registries through the intermediate registry.*” Support for this amendment can be found, for example, in Figure 2 of the application and related sections of the specification.

Applicants submit that amended claim 17 is not anticipated by Jacobs. Applicants note that the Examiner addresses claim 17 in section 14 of the Action by making reference to the Examiner’s previous rejection of claims 1 and 2. Applicants note that the arguments provided above with reference to amended claim 1 of the present application address the previous rejection of claims 1 and 2. In this respect, Applicants submit that similar arguments can be used with reference to amended claim 17 to state that amended claim 17 is not anticipated by Jacobs. In particular, Applicants note that claim 17 recites “an intermediate registry server”. How can a “server” be anticipated by a client? This is what the Examiner appears to state when he finds the presence of such server inside client 504 in Figure 5A of Jacobs. What claim 17 recites is a combination of an object server, two object

U.S. Patent Application No: 10/674,879

Page 13

registries, and an intermediate registry server. Such combination is not anticipated by Jacobs.

b) In section 16 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 18-27 and 31 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pub. App. No. 2000/099970 to Zhao et al.

Claim 18

Applicants have amended claim 18 to recite that the intermediate registry comprises "*means to receive the access data from the object server.*" Support for this amendment can be found, for example, in Figure 2 of the application and related sections of the specification.

Applicants submit that amended claim 18 is not anticipated by Zhao. Applicants note that the Examiner addresses claim 18 in section 17 of the Action by making reference to i) a binding...binding interceptor...bind method (page 3, paragraphs 0035/0036 of Zhao), ii) an alternative server (page 3, paragraphs 0035/0036 of Zhao), and iii) ...return...(page 3, paragraphs 0035/0036, Figures 5/6, page 3, paragraphs 0040/0041 of Zhao).

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner and note that amended claim 18 recites three different entities associated with the claimed intermediate registry server: 1) an object server; 2) a first object registry and 3) a second object registry. To the contrary, even assuming, *arguendo*, that the 'bind interceptor' in Zhao is indeed an intermediate registry server (which is not, because Zhao clearly states that the 'bind interceptor' is a Java class, see line 10 of paragraph [0034] in Zhao), such interceptor is only associated to an object server and to an alternative object server, in stark contrast with claim 18 where association is with an object server, a first object registry and a second object registry as recited above.

U.S. Patent Application No: 10/674,879

Page 14

Claim 19

Applicants have amended claim 19 to recite that the intermediate registry comprises "*means to receive the access data from the object server.*" Support for this amendment can be found, for example, in Figure 2 of the application and related sections of the specification.

Applicants submit that amended claim 19 is not anticipated by Zhao. Applicants note that the Examiner addresses independent claim 19 in section 18 of the Action by making reference to the Examiner's previous rejection of claim 18. Applicants note that the arguments provided above with reference to amended claim 18 of the present application address the previous rejection of claim 18. In this respect, Applicants submit that similar arguments can be used with reference to amended claim 19 to state that amended claim 19 is not anticipated by Zhao.

Claim 20

Applicants note that the Examiner addresses claim 20 in section 18 of the Action by making reference to the Examiner's previous rejection of claim 18. Applicants draw the Examiner's attention to the fact that Claim 18 recites an intermediate registry server and not a method for remote object invocation as recited in claim 20. Applicants believe that such reference is not proper in view of the different nature of claims 18 and 20.

Further, Applicants have amended claim 20 to incorporate the language of claim 21 and to also recite that the method comprises the step "*of supplying, from an object server, the access data to the first and second object registries through the intermediate server.*" Support for this amendment can be found, for example, in Figure 2 of the application and related sections of the specification.

Applicants submit that amended claim 20 is not anticipated by Zhao. Applicants note that the Examiner addresses claim 21 in section 19 of the Action by making

U.S. Patent Application No: 10/674,879

Page 15

reference to an 'alternative server' and 'another object reference' disclosed in Zhao at page 3 paragraphs 0035/0036.

By way of introduction, Applicants note that the arguments provided above by Applicants with reference to amended claim 18 of the present application can be used to rebut the Examiner's rejection of claims 20 and 21 based on Zhao. For example, Applicants note that amended claim 20 recites a step *"of supplying, from an object server, the access data to the first and second object registries through the intermediate registry"* not disclosed in Zhao. Moreover, three different entities are associated with the intermediate server of amended claim 20: 1) an object server, 2) a first remote object registry and 3) a second remote object registry. To the contrary, the 'bind interceptor' in Zhao is only associated to an object server and an alternative object server.

Therefore, amended claim 20 is novel over Zhao, together with claims 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27 and 31, at least by virtue of their direct or indirect dependency on claim 20.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

In section 27 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 3-8, 11 and 28 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobs et al. in view of Zhao et al. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In section 28 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claim 3 as being obvious over Jacobs in view of Zhao. Applicants note that claim 3 depends on claim 1 and that the Examiner's rejection is based on the Examiner's previous rejection of claim 1 not being novel over Jacobs. In view of the Applicants' amendments to claim 1 and above arguments with respect to claim 1, Applicants submit that the Examiner has not established a prima facie 35 USC 103(a) case against claim 3 when depending on claim 1 as amended. Therefore, claim 3 is submitted to be patentable over Jacobs and Zhao.

U.S. Patent Application No: 10/674,879

Page 16

Similar considerations apply to claims 4 and 5, reference being made to sections 29 and 30 of the Action.

Claim 6

Applicants have amended claim 6 to make it independent by incorporating the language of claims 1 and 7. Applicants submit that amended claim 6 is new and non-obvious over Jacobs and Zhao.

In sections 31 and 32 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 6 and 7, respectively, under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Jacobs in view of Zhao. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In particular, the Examiner addresses the features of claim 6 and 7 by making reference to an alternative server (page 3 paragraph 0035 of Zhao). However, Applicants note to the Examiner that amended claim 6 recites that the *"first predetermined instruction [is] arranged to support access to both of the first and second object registries and to request both of the first and second access data substantially simultaneously."* Where in Jacobs or in Zhao are the access and the request to both the first and second object registries substantially simultaneous? There is no such disclosure. For example, in paragraph 0035 of Zhao mentioned by the Examiner, a 'bind interceptor' provides the user with an option to select an alternative server when a previously adequately operating system later fails. Therefore access to the two resources in Zhao is alternative and not simultaneous.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claims 6 is patentable over Jacobs and Zhao, together with claims 8, 9, 10 and 11 at least by virtue of their direct or indirect dependency on claim 6

Claim 28

Applicants have amended claim 28 to make it independent by incorporating the language of claim 20 and to also recite 1) that the *"remote object invocation [is]*

U.S. Patent Application No: 10/674,879

Page 17

from a first environment of a remote object hosted by or accessible by a second environment”, 2) the step “of issuing at least a first request for access data for a remote object to a first remote object registry hosted by first server operating in active mode”, 3) the step “of supplying, from an object server, the access data to the first object registry” and 4) that “remote object server operat[es] in stand-by mode.” Support for this amendment can be found, for example, in Figure 4 of the application and related sections of the specification.

Applicants submit that amended claim 28 is non obvious over Zhao and Jacobs. Applicants note that the Examiner addresses the features of original claim 28 in section 35 of the Action by making reference to Jacobs and, in particular, to i) an RA stub (column 14, lines 23-47 of Jacobs), ii) a name tree (column 5, lines 7-10 of Jacobs), iii) a JNDI-compliant naming service/server 302 (column 14, lines 23-47 of Jacobs), iv) the presence of the term ‘duplicate’ (column 5, lines 7-10 of Jacobs), and v) a replicated naming service/server 303 (column 14, lines 23-47).

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner and note that amended claim 28 recites the step *“of directing the access request, from the first remote object server, to the second remote object server, in the event of a fault associated with the first server.”* Where is the step of directing the access request from the first remote object server, to the second remote object server shown in Jacobs? With reference to Figure 4 in Jacobs, as already mentioned above for amended claim 12, server 302 and server 303 are connected to a communication medium 301. Where does Jacobs discuss that there is a migration of a communication channel between 302 and 303 or vice versa? When one of the two Jacobs’ servers does not work, there is just switching by the client (or the object server) to the other server, without any kind of migration occurring between those servers.

Moreover, amended claim 28 also recites that the servers are operated in *“active”* and *“stand-by”* modes. Where is this kind of operation shown in Jacobs?

U.S. Patent Application No: 10/674,879
Page 18

* * * *

In view of the arguments presented in this response, allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 08-2025. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 08-2025.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, fax no. (571)-273-8300 on

January 25, 2007

(Date of Deposit)

Susan Papp
(Name of Person Depositing)

Susan Papp

Signature

01/25/07

Date

Respectfully submitted,

Alessandro Steinf

Alessandro Steinf
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 56,448
LADAS & PARRY
5670 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 2100
Los Angeles, CA 90036
(323)934-2300